

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT  
ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1988-89

Community College Faculty Sal  
Administrators' Salaries at the  
University of California and th  
California State University  
Medical School Faculty Salari

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY  
EDUCATION COMMISSION



# Summary

In response to Supplemental Language to the 1978, 1979, and 1981 Budget Acts, the California Post-secondary Education Commission prepares annual reports on administrators' salaries at the University of California and the California State University as well as faculty salaries at the California Community Colleges. In addition, it prepares biennial reports on University of California medical faculty salaries in odd-numbered years.

This document contains those three elements:

- Part One on pages 3-14 presents an overview of faculty salaries in the California Community Colleges and estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at \$42,035.
- Part Two on pages 15-18 shows the salaries of campus-based and central office administrators at the University and the State University, with comparison institution data for the campus-based positions.
- And Part Three on pages 21-23 shows salaries for University full-time faculty physicians in the specialties of general medicine, surgery, and pediatrics, in comparison to those received by their counterparts at comparable institutions.

This report, which deliberately provides only descriptive data for use by the State and offers neither conclusions nor recommendations about these data, was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on September 18, 1989, on recommendation of its Policy Evaluation Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Publication Office of the Commission at (916) 324-4991. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

# SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1988-89

*A Report to the Governor  
and Legislature in Response  
to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965)  
and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation*

**CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION**  
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985





**COMMISSION REPORT 89-26**  
**PUBLISHED SEPTEMBER 1989**

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 89-26 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

## *Contents*

Executive Summary	1
1. Community College Faculty Salaries	3
Introduction	3
Average Salaries	3
Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time Faculty with Overload Assignments	5
Summary of the Data	8
Implications of the Data	14
Uses of Part-Time Faculty and AB 1725	14
2. Selected Administrators' Salaries in Universities	15
Introduction	15
University of California	15
The California State University	16
3. Medical School Faculty Salaries at the University of California	21
Appendices	25
A. Letter from Kenneth B. O'Brien to Gerald Hayward, August 9, 1979	25
B. University of California Report on Medical School Clinical Compensation Plans and Clinical Faculty Salaries, 1979	27
References	51

# *Displays*

1. Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1988-89	4
2. The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988	6
3. The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988	7
4. Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988	8
5. Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1986-87 to 1988-89	9-10
6. Peralta Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89	11
7. Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89	11
8. Saddleback Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1988-89	12
9. Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1986 to Fall 1988	13
10. Annualized Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1988-89	16
11. Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1988-89	17
12. Annualized Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1988-89	18
13. Estimated Annualized Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, effective July 1, 1989	19
14. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89 (General Medicine)	22
15. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89 (Surgery)	22
16. University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89 (Pediatrics)	23
17. Ranking of University of California Medical Faculty Compensation in Relation to the Amounts Paid at its Comparison Institutions, Selected Years from 1980-81 to 1988-89	23

# *Executive Summary*

THIS report consists of three independent sections

## **1. Community College faculty salaries**

Part One responds to Supplemental Language to the 1979 Budget Act, which directed the Commission to prepare annual reports on the salaries of California Community College faculty members. It presents an overview of those salaries and estimates the mean salary of regular and contract faculty at \$42,035. It indicates that the difference in mean salaries between the highest-paying and lowest-paying of the 71 districts in the State is about 37 percent. Finally, it shows that on a statewide basis, full-time faculty salaries are nearly twice as high per weekly faculty contact hour as part-time faculty, and about 60 percent more than overload faculty. If fringe benefits are added, this disparity is even greater.

## **2. Selected administrators' salaries in universities**

Part Two responds to Supplemental Language in the 1981 Budget Act, which instructed the Commission to report annually on the salaries of University of California and California State University administrators. It shows the salaries of campus-based and central office administrative positions at the University and State University, with comparison data for the campus-based positions.

This part also shows that, for several reasons, campus-based administrative salaries at the University of California lag behind the mean salaries reported by its comparison institutions in 17 of the 18 administrative positions surveyed for this report, with the

differences ranging from 1.6 percent for directors of campus security to 25.7 percent for directors of computer centers. Only the deans of agriculture at the University earn more on the average than their comparison institution counterparts, and the Chancellors of the University's campuses on the average earn 21.7 percent less than their counterparts.

At the State University, campus administrators in five positions receive between 0.3 and 20.6 percent more than the mean of their counterparts at comparison institutions, while campus administrators in 11 other positions receive between 0.1 and 23.6 percent less. State University campus presidents receive 18.8 percent less than their counterparts at comparison institutions.

## **3. Medical school faculty salaries at the University of California**

Part Three responds to Supplemental Language to the 1978 Budget Act that requested the Commission to report on the University of California's medical school faculty salaries. It shows salaries for University full-time faculty physicians in the specialties of general medicine, surgery, and pediatrics, and it compares them to full-time clinical faculty salaries at comparison institutions.

In general, the University remains competitive in its compensation of medical school faculty. In 1988-89, for the three ladder ranks within the three specialties surveyed, the University's medical faculty salaries exceeded similar comparison institution salaries in five categories and lagged in the remaining four, and full professors in all three specialties at the University received more than the average of their counterparts.

# 1 *Community College Faculty Salaries*

## Introduction

In February 1979, the Legislative Analyst recommended in the *Analysis of the Budget Bill, 1979-80*, that the Commission include information on California Community College faculty salaries in its annual faculty salary reports. Responding to this recommendation, the Commission presented data on community college faculty salaries for the 1977-78 fiscal year in its report, *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80*, of April 1979, but it was unable to include data for 1978-79 (the then current year) because the Chancellor's Office had abandoned such data collection as part of the cutbacks resulting from the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978.

Subsequently, Commission staff proposed that the submission of community college faculty salary data be formalized, and for that purpose the Legislature appropriated \$15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the 1979-80 fiscal year. In August 1979, Commission staff outlined for the Chancellor the specific information desired (Appendix A, pp. 25-26) and asked the Chancellor's staff to submit 1978-79 data by November 1, 1979, and data for subsequent fiscal years by March 1 of the year involved.

In 1981-82, the Chancellor's Office initiated the "Staff Data File" -- a computerized data collection system that is now in its eighth year of operation and that has provided comprehensive reports for the past seven years.

During these years, the Chancellor's Office has produced comprehensive and accurate reports that contain information on average salaries and salary ranges, cost-of-living adjustments, teaching loads, numbers of full- and part-time faculty, age, sex, and ethnicity, number of new hires, promotions, and leaves, and qualifications for various salary categories.

Although reporting is substantially improved from prior years, two problems remain:

- The first relates to the submission of data that are incomplete due primarily to protracted collective bargaining negotiations. When negotiations extend into the spring of the current academic year, and cost-of-living adjustments are accordingly allocated retroactively, there is seldom sufficient time to include the increases in the mean salary figures reported. The result is that many of the mean salaries reported are inaccurate. In addition, 19 of the system's 71 districts did not report cost-of-living adjustments.
- The second problem is that complete salary adjustments are not always reported. In 1988-89, for example, one-time "off-schedule" adjustments were granted to faculty in six districts. In addition, in its analysis of salaries the Chancellor's Office averages all increases granted after July 1 over the entire year. Thus, a 5 percent increase granted on January 1 is only counted as a 2.5 percent increase, even though the effect is to lift the entire salary schedule by 5 percent by the end of the fiscal year. These analytical differences in computing average salaries are discussed further in the next section.

## Average salaries

Display 1 on page 4 shows 1988-89 mean salaries as reported by 69 of the 71 districts, with Feather River and Lassen Community College Districts not reporting. The first footnote in that display indicates that 11 districts did not report cost-of-living increases for 1988-89 and consequently could not incorporate such increases into their mean salary figures. Consequently, the salaries reported more nearly approximate 1987-88 salaries for those districts. The second footnote includes 18 districts where salary negotiations were complete but which did not have sufficient time to incorporate those increases into their mean salary figures.

In all, Display 1 indicates that accurate current-year data are available for only 40 districts -- 56.3



**DISPLAY 1 Mean Salaries in the California Community Colleges, 1988-89**

District	Mean Salary	District	Mean Salary
Allan Hancock <sup>2</sup>	\$38,651	Palomar	\$43,164
Antelope Valley	38,554	Pasadena Area	41,457
Barstow <sup>1</sup>	38,935	Peralta	37,432
Butte <sup>2</sup>	40,429	Rancho Santiago	43,009
Cabrillo <sup>1</sup>	35,286	Redwoods	41,417
Cerritos <sup>2</sup>	46,009	Rio Hondo	45,299
Chaffey	41,236	Riverside <sup>1</sup>	41,214
Citrus <sup>2</sup>	41,910	Saddleback	48,413
Coachella Valley <sup>2</sup> (Desert)	38,879	San Bernardino <sup>1</sup>	40,250
Coast	41,170	San Diego	39,828
Compton <sup>1</sup>	35,268	San Diego Adult	30,073
Contra Costa	47,661	San Francisco Centers	36,869
El Camino	43,846	San Francisco	42,216
Feather River	N/A	San Joaquin Delta <sup>2</sup>	46,311
Foothill/DeAnza	45,363	San Jose <sup>2</sup>	42,658
Fremont-Newark <sup>2</sup>	41,675	San Luis Obispo	42,497
Gavilan <sup>2</sup>	40,086	San Mateo	45,328
Glendale	44,749	Santa Barbara <sup>2</sup>	38,571
Grossmont <sup>2</sup>	40,347	Santa Clarita	42,039
Hartnell	40,806	Santa Monica <sup>2</sup>	43,585
Imperial <sup>2</sup>	35,233	Sequoias	45,074
Kern	38,519	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	40,655
Lake Tahoe <sup>1</sup>	38,125	Sierra	41,428
Lassen	N/A	Siskiyou <sup>1</sup>	36,524
Long Beach <sup>2</sup>	44,088	Solano County <sup>1</sup>	40,479
Los Angeles <sup>2</sup>	41,613	Sonoma County	44,221
Los Rios <sup>1</sup>	39,911	South County	44,085
Marin <sup>2</sup>	46,753	Southwestern	42,240
Mendocino	36,791	State Center	42,910
Merced	42,178	Ventura County	43,845
Mira Costa	41,896	Victor Valley	38,166
Monterey Peninsula <sup>2</sup>	38,430	West Hills	40,230
Mount San Antonio	44,192	West Kern	45,916
Mount San Jacinto <sup>2</sup>	37,699	West Valley	44,129
Napa <sup>1</sup>	35,453	Yosemite	43,393
North Orange	43,729	Yuba	42,564
Palo Verde <sup>1</sup>	35,731	Total	\$42,035 <sup>3</sup>

1 District was still in the process of salary negotiations for 1988-89 at the time mean salary data were reported. Consequently, the salaries reported more closely approximate the 1987-88 mean.

2 Although salary negotiations were complete as of the Chancellor's Office deadline for reporting data, mean salary data do not reflect the 1988-89 cost-of-living adjustment. Consequently, the salaries reported may more closely approximate the 1987-88 mean.

3 Feather River and Lassen Community College Districts did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

Source: Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office.

percent of the 71 possible -- with the faculty employed by those districts representing 60.6 percent of the systemwide total. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual mean salary for the system is higher than the \$42,035 reported. To provide an estimate of actual salaries, the mean salaries of the 29 nonreporting districts (excluding Feather River and Lassen), were incremented by 4.79 percent -- the average percent increase for the 40 reporting districts, which resulted in a systemwide mean salary of \$42,796. There is no way of knowing how accurate that figure may be, but it is probably closer to reality than the \$42,035 contained in the Chancellor's Office report.

Displays 2 and 3 on pages 6 and 7 show mean salaries as reported in the Staff Data File for regular and contract faculty in the ten highest- and ten lowest-paying districts for selected years between Fall 1986 and Fall 1988, and the systemwide means for each of those years. In each case, those districts reporting incomplete mean salary data are indicated. Display 4 on page 8 shows mean salaries for those districts as a group, the percentage difference between them, and the total number of faculty.

In 1988-89, the highest-paying district was Saddleback with a mean of \$48,413. The lowest was Imperial with a mean of \$35,233 -- although it should be noted that Imperial's faculty were still in negotiations with respect to their existing contract with their district's administration. Among those districts that had finalized negotiations, the lowest paying was the Peralta District at \$37,432 -- a figure 29.3 percent lower than Saddleback's.

Display 5 on pages 9 and 10 provides cost-of-living adjustment data, by district, for the current and previous two years, weighted by the size of faculty in each district. In each case, off-schedule payments and mid-year adjustments are reflected, inclusions that increase the systemwide average from the 4.00 percent reported by the Chancellor's Office for 1987-88 to 4.91 percent, and the 4.77 percent reported for 1988-89 to 4.79 percent.

From Display 2 it can be seen that those districts with higher salaries tend to be the larger districts and also tend to be those reporting complete data. These higher salaries actually become more pronounced if the evening programs at San Diego and San Francisco are included in the overall districtwide average. Faculty working in these evening

programs tend to be paid about one-fourth less than regular faculty at the main campus, and their inclusion consequently reduces the districtwide average. Were they to be included, the differences between the highest- and lowest-paying districts, as shown in Display 4, would be even greater, thus highlighting the size factor even more. Either way, the difference in mean salaries between the highest-paying district (Saddleback) and the lowest-paying district (Imperial) is about 37 percent. Taken as groups of the ten highest and ten lowest, the difference is 27.3 percent, but considering that eight of the ten lowest-paying but only three of the ten highest-paying districts reported incomplete data, the true difference between these two groups is probably closer to 25 percent.

The Chancellor's Office also provided salary schedules for each of the 71 districts in the community college system. These generally provide a number of salary categories or classes through which a faculty member can advance depending on educational qualifications, and another series of steps that provide salary increases based on longevity. Typical schedules are shown in Displays 6, 7, and 8 on pages 11 and 12 and present the marked differences that exist between low-, medium-, and high-paying districts.

As with mean salaries, these schedules vary greatly from district to district, with some districts offering only one salary classification based on educational achievement, while others offer as many as nine. In addition, some districts have as few as 12 anniversary increments, while others have 30 or more. In some cases, additional stipends are provided to doctoral degree holders, department chairmen, and others with special qualifications or responsibilities.

#### **Part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments**

For many years, the community colleges have employed a large number of part-time or temporary faculty, and most districts have also permitted full-time regular and contract faculty to work additional hours or overloads. Display 9 on page 13 shows several comparisons between full-time, part-time, and overload faculty between Fall 1986 and Fall

**DISPLAY 2 The Ten Highest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988**

Ten Highest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts						
Year	1981	1983	1985	1986	1987	1988
Number of Districts	69	70	70	69	68	69
Saddleback	\$35,071	\$37,697	\$42,083	\$41,815	\$46,335	\$48,413
Contra Costa	32,813		39,047	43,998	43,979	47,661
Marin <sup>1</sup>					45,013	46,753
San Joaquin Delta <sup>1</sup>	36,275	35,579	41,562	44,029	45,923	46,311
Cerritos <sup>1</sup>	33,153	34,900	39,258	41,746	44,097	46,009
West Kern		36,786	38,975	41,934	44,201	45,916
Foothill/DeAnza	33,234		41,547	41,711	43,466	45,363
San Mateo						45,323
Rio Hondo				40,481	43,602	45,299
Sequoias	32,116	38,750				45,074
Southwestern					42,764	
Mt San Antonio		34,942	38,417	40,632	42,685	
Long Beach	33,404	34,754	39,547	42,326		
Santa Monica	32,033		39,809	41,334		
San Jose		35,053				
Coast	33,245	35,015				
North Orange	32,070					
Desert			39,211			
El Camino		37,110				
<b>Statewide Mean Salary<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>\$30,156</b>	<b>\$32,704</b>	<b>\$36,203</b>	<b>\$38,005</b>	<b>\$40,046</b>	<b>\$42,035</b>

1 Annualized 1988-89 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported

2 Weighted by total faculty in each district.

Source Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

1988 For example, it shows the number of full-time faculty with and without overload assignments compared to the number of part-time faculty. It also shows workload in terms of weekly faculty contact hours (WFCH) -- the actual number of hours faculty spend in classrooms. Comparing these two, it can be seen that, while part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty by almost two-to-one, they teach only 35.3 percent of these contact hours. Regular and contract faculty teach 58.2 percent on regular assignments, with those teaching overloads accounting for the remaining 6.5 percent. Regular

and contract faculty on regular assignments average 16.9 weekly faculty contact hours in 1988-89, while part-time faculty average 5.4 hours, and those teaching any overload average 4.7 additional hours. About 40.3 percent of full-time regular and contract faculty members teach some overload. All of these averages have been relatively constant for the three-year period shown in Display 9.

Compensation comparisons between full-time and part-time faculty are difficult, since full-time faculty have responsibilities other than classroom teaching, while part-time faculty generally do not. Full-

**DISPLAY 3    *The Ten Lowest California Community College Mean Salaries Among Reporting Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988***

Ten Lowest Paying Districts Each Year and Number of Reporting Districts						
Year Number of Districts	1981 69	1983 70	1985 70	1986 69	1987 68	1988 69
Imperial <sup>1</sup>			\$30,900	\$32,090	\$32,642	\$35,233
Compton <sup>1</sup>	25,809	29,091	30,632	30,929	34,475	35,268
Cabrillo <sup>1</sup>		28,631	32,264	32,960	33,768	35,286
Napa <sup>1</sup>		28,245	31,442	33,099	33,581	35,453
Palo Verde <sup>1</sup>	25,369		30,930		34,505	35,731
Siskiyou <sup>1</sup>		28,326			34,843	36,524
Mendocino					36,460	36,791
Peralta	26,060	29,213			36,275	37,432
Mount San Jacinto <sup>1</sup>						37,699
Lake Tahoe <sup>1</sup>		28,429				38,125
San Diego <sup>1, 2</sup>	\$22,707					
West Hills					36,346	
Lassen	27,416	29,098	32,308	32,856		
Allan Hancock	27,469	28,401		33,962		
Victor Valley			31,967	34,061		
Monterey Peninsula				34,385		
Santa Barbara				34,794		
Gavilan	26,555		32,234			
Antelope Valley	26,440	29,185	32,341			
San Francisco <sup>1, 3</sup>	27,460					
Barstow	26,476					
<b>Statewide Mean Salary<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>\$30,156</b>	<b>\$32,704</b>	<b>\$36,203</b>	<b>\$38,005</b>	<b>\$40,046</b>	<b>\$42,035</b>

1 Annualized 1988-89 cost-of-living adjustment not included in the mean salary data reported

2 Weighted by total faculty in each district.

3 Regular and centers programs combined

Source Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

time faculty spend time in counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service. Preparation for classroom teaching, however, necessarily occupies a considerable amount of time for both full-time and part-time faculty. The exact proportion of total workload devoted to activities not directly related to classroom teaching is not known, but an assumption used recently by the Chancellor's Office (1987, p. 7) is that three-fourths

is instructionally related (teaching and preparation) with the remaining one-fourth devoted to other campus activities. With this factor, although not a precise measure, it is possible to present a general comparison.

The Chancellor's Office publishes hourly rates for part-time faculty and full-time faculty with overload assignments, and these systemwide data are

**DISPLAY 4 Analysis of the Mean Salaries Paid by the Highest and Lowest Paying Community College Districts, Selected Years from Fall 1981 to Fall 1988**

Item	Fall 1981	Fall 1983	Fall 1985	Fall 1986	Fall 1987	Fall 1988
<b>Mean Salaries</b>						
<b>Ten Highest Paying Districts</b>						
Weighted <sup>1</sup>	\$33,213	\$35,748	\$40,059	\$42,144	\$44,137	\$46,304
Unweighted	33,341	36,059	39,946	42,001	44,207	46,212
<b>Ten Lowest Paying Districts</b>						
Weighted <sup>1</sup>	\$26,675	\$28,563	\$31,547	\$32,515	\$34,454	\$36,399
Unweighted	26,563	28,645	31,619	32,422	34,600	36,354
<b>Percent By Which The Ten Highest Paying Districts Exceed The Ten Lowest Paying Districts (Weighted Means)</b>	24 5%	25 2%	27 0%	29.6%	28 1%	27 3%
<b>Systemwide Mean Salary (69 Districts)<sup>1</sup></b>	\$30,156	\$32,704	\$36,203	\$38,005	\$40,046	\$42,035
<b>Number of Regular Faculty</b>						
Ten Highest Paying Districts	3,354	2,572	2,044	2,182	2,022	2,121
Ten Lowest Paying Districts	2,595	1,891	974	1,341	1,205	833
<b>Percent Higher Paying Districts Exceed Lower Paying Districts (Total Faculty)</b>	29 2%	36 0%	109 9%	62 7%	67 8%	154 6%

<sup>1</sup> Weighted by total full-time faculty in each reporting district.

Source Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

also shown in Item 5 in Display 9, which indicates that overload faculty are currently paid about 17 percent more than part-time faculty

Items 7 and 8 in Display 9 compare the estimate of compensation per weekly faculty contact hour for full-time faculty with the actual data reported for part-time and overload faculty. Also on a system-wide basis, these comparisons show full-time faculty in 1988-89 earning nearly twice as much (88 0 percent) per weekly faculty contact hour in salary as part-time faculty, and 60 6 percent more than the amount paid for overload assignments. If fringe benefits are added, these percentages would be even higher.

### Summary of the data

In the current year, regular and contract faculty for which complete data exist earned an average salary of \$42,035, -- an amount that is probably understated by 2 to 3 percent, since only 40 districts submitted complete data in time for inclusion in the Chancellor's Office report. Eighteen other districts reported the percentage amount of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) but could not include the increase in their mean salary figures. Eleven districts were still in the process of negotiating current-year increases and thus could not report a cost-

**DISPLAY 5 Annualized Cost-of-Living Adjustments Granted to Regular and Contract California Community College Faculty, By District, 1986-87 to 1988-89**

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1988-89	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-89
Allan Hancock	94	6 00%	5 00%	4 07%
Antelope Valley	82	4 30	5 10	2 62
Barstow	24	5 50	*	*
Butte	104	5 82	6 65	5 23
Cabrillo	157	4 00	4 00	*
Cerritos	210	5 77	5 20	5 70
Chaffey	138	3 14	6 00	5 00
Citrus	112	5 50	4 50	4 00
Coast	524	0 00	2 00	7 01
Compton	69	6 50	7 00	*
Contra Costa	376	5 00	4 00	4 70
Desert (Coachella Valley)	99	5 00	5 50	6 50
El Camino	270	5 00	5 00	5 00
Feather River	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Foothill	340	6 50	5 00	5 00
Fremont-Newark	89	6 00	4 00	4 70
Gavilan	50	6 50	5 25	5 00
Glendale	146	5 00	3 00	8 00
Grossmont	215	6 00	6 50	6 00
Hartnell	77	6 00	1 80	4 00
Imperial	71	0 00	9 00	9 00
Kern	265	2 00	3 42	5 00
Lake Tahoe	16	0 00	7 00	*
Lassen	N/A	0 00	3 40	5 00
Long Beach	245	6 50	4 00	4 35
Los Angeles	1,619	0 00	7 00	6 00
Los Rios	572	1 34	9 58	*
Marin	134	15 10	3 50	6 10
Mendocino	36	5 70	2 95	6 20
Merced	87	4 00	6 00	6 20
MiraCosta	69	5 50	4 00	4 91
Monterey Peninsula	94	6 65	5 00	5 40
Mt San Antonio	249	5 00	4 25	5 00
Mt San Jacinto	40	6 02	6 26	5 25
Napa	89	2 13	2 38	*
North Orange	435	7 00	6 00	1 00
Palo Verde	12	3 50	4 50	4 32
Palomar	213	6 44	5 00	*
Pasadena Area	284	6.00	6 00	6 12
Peralta	302	7 00	0 00	3 00

(continued)

**DISPLAY 5, continued**

District	Number of Full-Time Faculty 1988-89	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1986-87	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1987-88	Cost-of-Living Adjustments, 1988-89
Rancho Santiago	260	6 01%	4 28%	2 40%
Redwoods	82	5 30	4 80	4 72
Rio Hondo	158	5 00	3 40	4 70
Riverside	172	6 50	4 00	*
Saddleback	219	4 00	4 64	6 70
San Bernardino	175	8 00	3 40	*
San Diego	377	6 00	8 00	7 00
San Diego Adult	80	N/A	8 00	7 00
San Francisco Centers	239	N/A	0 00	7 00
San Francisco	376	6 50	0 00	7 00
San Joaquin Delta	203	6 45	5 50	4 90
San Jose	188	5 00	4 75	4 75
San Luis Obispo	72	4 59	6 58	6 70
San Mateo	336	4 00	5 00	6 00
Santa Barbara	154	9 00	3 40	5 74
Santa Clarita	55	7 00	5 00	6 70
Santa Monica	199	5 00	6 00	6 00
Sequoias	127	4 50	5 20	5 30
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity	112	8 00	3 00	3 50
Sierra	108	6 14	4 00	4 00
Siskiyou	41	5 00	0 00	5 00
Solano County	121	6 00	3 00	*
Sonoma County	217	4 00	5 25	6 00
South County	189	5 50	4 00	4 50
Southwestern	172	8 00	7 00	5 00
State Center	274	5 00	5 00	6 75
Ventura County	257	4 00	6 00	7 00
Victor Valley	60	*	5 00	5 00
West Hills	43	5 00	5 20	5 30
West Kern	18	5 06	2 10	5 00
West Valley	238	5 00	6 00	5 05
Yosemite	192	8 00	3 40	4 80
Yuba	92	3 10	6 00	5 75
Number of Districts Reporting	--	68	69	
Total/Mean -- Excluding San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,614 <sup>1</sup>	4 58%	4 91%	4 67%
Total/Mean -- Including San Diego Evening and San Francisco Centers	13,295 <sup>1</sup>	4 54%	5 03%	4 79%

<sup>1</sup> Feather River and Lassen Community College Districts did not report data to the Chancellor's Office in time for this report.

\* District was still in salary negotiations at the time of the Chancellor's Office deadline for submitting data

Source Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

**DISPLAY 6 Peralta Community College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89**

Step	A	B	C	D	E
1	\$19,562	\$21,065	\$22,565	\$24,095	\$25,599
2	20,750	22,254	23,786	25,285	26,790
3	21,970	23,472	24,975	26,448	27,968
4	23,162	24,666	26,167	27,716	29,154
5	24,353	25,855	27,388	28,849	30,308
6	25,572	27,077	28,545	30,005	31,464
7	26,764	28,241	29,702	31,162	32,652
8	27,938	29,401	30,886	32,346	33,810
9	29,124	30,581	32,042	33,508	34,960
10	30,278	31,740	33,200	34,665	36,151
11			34,363	35,850	37,311
12			34,475	37,007	38,466
13			34,587	37,119	38,579
14				37,231	38,691
15				37,344	38,803
16				37,456	38,915
17					39,028
18					39,140

Source Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

**DISPLAY 7 Sonoma County Junior College District Faculty Salary Schedule, 1988-89**

Step	Class I BA	Class II BA + 30	Class III MA	Class IV MA + 20 units or BA + 55 units with MA	Class V MA + 40 units or BA + 75 units with MA	Class VI Doctorate
1	\$24,650	\$25,175	\$26,750	\$28,713	\$30,675	\$31,575
2	25,975	26,515	28,135	30,168	32,200	33,100
3	27,300	27,855	29,520	31,623	33,725	34,625
4	28,625	29,195	30,905	33,078	35,250	36,150
5	29,950	30,535	32,290	34,533	36,775	37,675
6	31,275	31,875	33,675	35,988	38,300	39,200
7	32,600	33,215	35,060	37,443	39,825	40,725
8	33,925	34,555	36,445	38,898	41,350	42,250
9	35,250	35,895	37,830	40,353	42,875	43,775
10	36,575	37,235	39,215	41,808	44,400	45,300
11			40,600	43,263	45,925	46,825
12			41,985	44,718	47,450	48,350

Source Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office



**DISPLAY 8 Saddleback Community College District Certificated Salary Schedule, 1988-89**

Step	I	II	III	IV	V
1	\$23,602	\$25,318	\$27,144	\$28,859	\$30,631
2	24,856	26,572	28,400	30,117	31,891
3	26,002	27,775	29,545	31,317	33,033
4	27,144	28,859	30,631	32,404	34,232
5	28,400	30,117	31,891	33,660	35,430
6	29,545	31,317	33,033	34,917	36,633
7	30,631	32,404	34,232	36,064	37,721
8	31,891	33,660	35,430	37,150	38,977
9	33,033	34,917	36,633	38,405	40,178
10	34,232	36,064	37,721	39,546	41,318
11		37,150	38,977	40,691	42,518
12		38,405	40,178	41,948	43,663
13		39,546	41,318	43,093	44,806
14		40,691	42,518	44,293	46,066
15		41,948	43,663	45,489	47,264
16			44,806	46,637	48,352
17			46,066	47,836	49,610
18			47,264	49,037	50,809
19			48,352	50,179	51,951
20			49,610	51,324	53,150
21*				52,498	54,324
22*				53,672	55,498
23*				54,846	56,672
24*				56,020	57,846
25*				57,194	59,020

\*Anniversary increment of \$1,174/year

Source Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

of-living adjustment figure. The two remaining districts -- Feather River and Lassen -- reported no information. Most of the 16 districts reporting no cost-of-living adjustment are likely to approve some increase in salary for all faculty.

For the 58 districts that did report cost-of-living adjustment data, the average increase for 1988-89 was 4.79 percent, once off-schedule adjustments are included. This compares to a comparable figure of about 5.03 percent in 1987-88. Part-time faculty continue to be paid about half the amount paid to full-time faculty on a per-contact-hour basis, and

the difference between them has increased slightly over the past three years. The number of part-time faculty employed has increased by 9.4 percent since 1986 -- from 23,795 to 26,031. The relative share of contact hours taught by full-time faculty has declined slightly, while the share taught by part-time faculty has increased slightly, and full-time faculty teaching overloads has not changed appreciably over the three-year period surveyed in this report.

The lack of complete mean salary data continues to be a problem with the Chancellor's Office Staff Data File, one that is probably unsolvable given the

**DISPLAY 9** *Analysis of the Mean Dollars per Weekly Faculty Contact Hour (WFCH) Paid to Full-Time Faculty, Part-Time Faculty, and Full-Time Faculty Teaching Overload Assignments in the California Community Colleges, Fall 1986 to Fall 1988*

Item	Fall 1986	Fall 1987	Fall 1988
<b>1 Number of Faculty Members</b>			
Full-Time Faculty <sup>1</sup>	8,632	8,132	8,124
Part-Time Faculty	23,795	25,056	26,031
Overload Faculty	5,101	5,349	5,490
<b>2 Total WFCH Taught</b>			
Full-Time Faculty	235,462	230,330	229,829
Part-Time Faculty	129,659	133,459	139,484
Overload Faculty	23,764	24,951	25,877
<b>3 Percentage Distribution of WFCH Taught</b>			
Full-Time Faculty	60 5%	59 3%	58 2%
Part-Time Faculty	33 3	34 3	35 3
Overload Faculty	6 1	6 4	6 5
<b>4 Mean WFCH Taught</b>			
Full-Time Faculty <sup>2</sup>	17 1	17 1	16 9
Part-Time Faculty	5 4	5 3	5 4
Overload Faculty	4 7	4 7	4.7
<b>5 Mean Dollars Paid per WFCH</b>			
Part-Time Faculty	\$25 50	\$26 77	\$28 38
Overload Faculty	30 34	31 36	33 22
<b>6 Compensation of Overload Faculty as a Percentage of Part-Time Faculty</b>	119 0%	117 1%	117 1%
<b>7 Mean Dollars Paid to Contract and Regular Faculty per WFCH, Assuming No Overload Assignments<sup>3</sup></b>			
Unadjusted	\$63 33	\$66 97	\$71 14
Adjusted <sup>4</sup>	47 50	50 23	53 36
<b>8 Compensation of Full-Time Faculty (Adjusted in Item 7) as a Percentage of Part-Time and Overload Faculty per WFCH</b>			
Part-Time Faculty	186 3%	187 6%	188 0%
Overload Faculty	156 6	160 2	160 6

1 No overload

2 Full-time faculty teaching regular assignments only

3 Based on a 35-week year

4 Dollar amount reduced by 25 percent to reflect additional responsibilities of regular and contract faculty such as counseling, advising, committee work, office hours, and community service.

Source. Derived from the Staff Data File, California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office

length of many collective bargaining negotiations and the early spring deadline for the Chancellor's Office report. For this reason, the data appearing in this chapter should be viewed with caution.

### **Implications of the data**

A major challenge facing the California Community Colleges through the year 2000 will be the recruitment of a large number of new faculty. Current Chancellor Office estimates suggest that some 18,000 new hires will be needed during the next 15 years in response to anticipated enrollment growth and to replace those who will leave the system through retirement or normal attrition (at present, the average age of full-time community college faculty members is about 49 years). The number of part-time faculty members, and their proper role in community college staffing, will also present a key issue regarding faculty quality during this time.

The data on community college faculty compensation presented in this section of the report reveal several conditions with major implications for the future:

- The salary disparity between districts may have adverse implications for current and future quality. These differences, like many others related to local control in a statewide financing system, create tensions that the current funding system appears unable to address.
- The use of part-time faculty is a second issue of concern. The number of these faculty has increased by over 9 percent in the last three years, and they continue to represent a major part of campus teaching loads. This increase may be inconsistent with the provisions of AB 1725, as noted below.

### **Uses of part-time faculty and AB 1725**

Colleges make temporary faculty appointments for a variety of reasons: to fill definable needs within a department, such as the replacement of regular faculty who have other assignments either on or off campus, to replace retired faculty, to fill full-time positions because of the lack of qualified applicants, to perform specialized functions such as teach reme-

dial or basic courses, to fill positions when tenured or tenure-track faculty are not available, and to meet the need for special or unique expertise. In addition, today's community college students are older, more frequently part-time, and often employed full-time. Many institutions have responded to these students by developing extensive evening class schedules and hiring part-time faculty to teach them.

There is general agreement that the Community Colleges need temporary faculty in order to respond to these staffing challenges and to provide certain courses that require special expertise. Yet the college administrators may have become increasingly dependent upon the use of part-time faculty not only to meet the special needs of students but also as a means of balancing their budgets.

In 1988, the Legislature adopted AB 1725, part of which requires the community colleges to employ by 1992 no more than 25 percent of its faculty on a part-time basis. In the past, temporary appointments may have been justified by budget limitations. The well-known "freeway flyer" -- the part-time faculty person who often commutes dozens of miles between campuses or even districts -- receives no fringe benefits and is compensated with only about half the salary of full-time faculty members.

However, the overuse of part-time faculty may be detrimental to the quality of community college instruction, and thus this use may not be desirable. Some faculty who will retire in the coming years will undoubtedly be replaced by part-time faculty because of deficiencies in the pool of qualified full-time faculty or to save on costs. The result may be a reduction of tenured faculty that in turn will have a consequent impact on the curricular responsibilities of the remaining tenured faculty, since part-time faculty are not normally required to carry out those responsibilities.

The implications of part-time faculty compensation, and the adequacy of current State policies regarding the use of part-time faculty at the community colleges, warrant further study. Later this year, the Commission will review through an exploratory study the use of part-time faculty at all three public segments and will discuss the implications regarding this issue.

# 2

## *Selected Administrators' Salaries in Universities*

### **Introduction**

During the 1981 Legislative Session, the Budget Conference Committee adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill

It is the intent of the Legislature that the California Postsecondary Education Commission include in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefits comparative information on salaries of administrators within the University of California and the California State University

Since 1981-82, the University and the State University have collected data from their comparison institutions and forwarded them to the Commission for analysis. The Commission has then included them in its report, together with additional data from the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). In this way, it has become possible to present a comparison between California's public institutions and those in the rest of the nation for a representative sample of administrative positions.

For several years, there was a lack of consensus as to which positions should be surveyed, which comparisons were valid, and which comparison institutions would provide the most useful data. Initially in 1981-82, a list of 25 administrative titles was selected from the list of 130 position descriptions developed by CUPA, and this number was reduced to as few as 15 in 1983-84. In 1986, the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology discussed the issue of administrators' salaries and compiled a list that should remain constant for the foreseeable future. That list includes 18 campus-based positions at both the University of California and the California State University, plus 12 and 10 positions from the respective central offices. It was also agreed that the same group of comparison institutions used for faculty analyses should be used for administrators, but only for the campus-based positions. Central office salaries are

to be reported, but without comparison to other systems across the country.

### **University of California**

Display 10 on page 16 shows the data submitted by the University of California and its comparison institutions for campus-based positions in 1988-89. Central office administrative positions are shown in Display 12 on page 18.

Last year, because of changes in the University's group of comparison institutions, and because of the data reported by those institutions, University administrative salaries trailed comparison group salaries in all 18 position categories. This year, University salaries trailed in 17 positions and exceeded salaries in only one position -- that of dean of agriculture. These campus-based University salaries reflect an annualized adjustment based on a 6.0 percent increase that became effective on June 1, 1989.

Several factors account for the University lags.

- First, University administrator's only received a 6 percent increase effective June 1, 1989 -- reflecting a one month salary increase for the 1988-89 fiscal year. If this 6 percent increase had taken effect on July 1, 1988, University salaries would appear more competitive.
- Second, the University's lag in several position categories may stem from the fact that comparison institutions may not have reported data for all comparative positions. If only high paying campuses report data on a particular position, the average salary reported may be skewed.
- Third, the University has in recent years added staff in various position categories. For example, in 1987-88, the University added three directors of athletics, which had the net effect of lowering the average for this position title. The addition

**DISPLAY 10** *Annualized Salaries of Campus-Based Administrators at the University of California and Its Eight Comparison Universities, 1988-89*

Administrative Title	University of California Average	Comparison Institution Average	University Exceeds or (Lags) Comparison Group by
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution	\$129,017	\$157,043	(21.7)%
Chief Academic Officer	115,938	131,356	(13.3)
Chief Business Officer	102,110	116,716	(14.3)
Director, Personnel/Human Resources	80,462	81,750	(1.6)
Chief Budgeting Officer	78,117	87,612	(12.2)
Director, Library Services	85,775	100,204	(16.8)
Director, Computer Center	76,798	96,498	(25.7)
Chief, Physical Plant	79,622	84,467	(6.1)
Director, Campus Security	64,210	65,207	(1.6)
Director, Information Systems	77,552	90,306	(16.5)
Director, Student Financial Aid	61,321	62,983	(2.7)
Director, Athletics	77,322	96,780	(25.2)
Dean of Agriculture	106,827	102,000	4.5
Dean of Arts and Sciences	96,321	117,469	(22.0)
Dean of Business	101,501	131,976	(30.0)
Dean of Education	97,658	101,199	(3.6)
Dean of Engineering	108,111	133,933	(23.9)
Dean of Graduate Programs	98,572	105,523	(7.1)

**Note** Comparison institutions include Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Stanford University, University of Illinois (Urbana), University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), University of Virginia, and the State University of New York (Buffalo)

**Source** University of California, Office of the President.

or deletion of staff can adversely affect the average salaries reported

Display 10, therefore, shows that one University of California campus-based administrative title is paid 4.5 percent more while the remaining 17 categories are paid between 1.6 and 25.7 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts. On the average, chancellors at the University are paid 21.7 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts, although their salaries became more competitive on June 1, 1989.

Displays 12 and 13 show the University's system-wide annualized salaries for 1988-89 and those effective July 1, 1989. These salaries are expected to increase further in January 1990 when additional salary adjustments are anticipated.

### **The California State University**

The California State University surveyed 16 campus-based positions, as shown in Display 11 on page

**DISPLAY 11 Administrative Salary Data for the California State University and Its Twenty Comparison Universities, 1988-89\***

Administrative Title	Number of California State University Campuses	California State University Average*	Number of Comparison Institutions	Comparison Institution Average	State University Exceeds or (Lags) Comparison Group by
Chief Executive Officer, Single Institution (President)	19	\$104,513	19	\$124,133	(18.8%)
Chief Academic Officer	19	88,084	15	102,041	(15.8)
Chief Business Officer	18	85,762	15	93,176	(8.6)
Director, Personnel/ Human Resources	14	57,825	17	57,903	(0.1)
Director of Libraries	18	69,245	19	69,021	(0.3)
Director of Computer Center	14	66,711	9	71,676	(7.4)
Director of Physical Plant	15	60,806	18	61,549	(1.2)
Director of Campus Security	18	55,347	16	43,973	20.6
Director of Institutional Research	10	63,410	13	56,082	11.6
Director of Student Financial Aid	19	55,698	18	50,735	8.9
Director, Athletics	17	67,177	14	66,230	1.4
Dean of Arts and Sciences	19	74,293	16	86,388	(16.3)
Dean of Business	19	75,638	15	93,499	(23.6)
Dean of Education	19	71,423	14	80,064	(12.1)
Dean of Engineering	11	81,733	11	94,722	(15.9)
Dean of Graduate Programs	7	72,530	14	77,551	(6.9)

\* Does not include 6 percent cost-of-living adjustment as of June 1, 1989

Note: Comparison institutions include Arizona State University, University of Bridgeport, Bucknell University (Pa.), Cleveland State University, University of Colorado (Denver), Georgia State University, Loyola University (Chicago), Mankato State University, University of Maryland (Baltimore), University of Nevada (Reno), North Carolina State University, Reed College, Rutgers University (Newark), State University of New York (Albany), University of Southern California, University of Texas (Arlington), Tufts University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Wayne State University, and University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)

Source: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

17, and nine central office administrators' salaries, as shown in Displays 12 and 13. For the campus-based positions, the State University pays between 0.3 and 20.6 percent more for five position titles, and between 0.1 and 23.6 percent less for 11 position titles. The State University consistently pays substantially more than its comparison universities to its directors of campus security, its directors of institutional research, and its directors of student financial aid, and consistently less to all of its

deans. In the dean category, the greatest divergence is for deans of business (23.6 percent below the comparison group), with the least lag for deans of graduate programs (6.9 percent less). State University campus presidents (\$104,513) are currently paid 6.9 percent less than their comparison institution counterparts.

It should be noted that the salary rate and range figures shown in Display 12 for central-office ad-

**DISPLAY 12** *Annualized Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, 1988-89*

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	University of California	Range of Increase Over 1987-88	Administrative Title and Number of Positions	The California State University <sup>3</sup>	Increase Over 1987-88 <sup>3</sup>
President (1)	\$203,591	4 0%	Chancellor (1)	\$129,173	6 0%
Senior Vice Presidents (2)	132,241	6 3	Executive Vice Chancellor (1)	112,799	6 0
Vice Presidents (3)	115,167 to 118,592	6 2	Vice Chancellors (4)	106,168 to 111,209	6 0
Associate Vice Presidents (4)	94,307 <sup>1</sup> to 109,315 <sup>1</sup>	7 6 <sup>2</sup>	Deputy Vice Chancellor (1)	89,063	6 0
Assistant Vice-Presidents (10)	79,170 <sup>1</sup> to 101,578 <sup>1</sup>	4 8 <sup>2</sup>	Assistant Vice Chancellors (10)	73,373 to 89,220	6 0
Director of State Governmental Relations (1)	89,545 <sup>1</sup>	6 8	Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	94,948	6 0
University Auditor (1)	80,965	6 0	University Auditor (1)	78,390	6 0
General Counsel (1)	135,567	6 5			
Treasurer (1)	155,867	5 5	General Counsel (1)	111,209	6 0
Associate Treasurer (1)	129,333	6 0			
Secretary to the Regents (1)	93,558	4 0	Associate General Counsel (1)	86,470	6 0

1 Effective January 1, 1989, a one time addition to salary was made to replace a 3 percent tax-deferred annuity contribution

2 Average percent increase over 1987-88 salary rates and ranges for the California State University's systemwide positions are as of Spring 1988

3 Assumes a 6 percent salary increase effective June 1, 1989, and does not reflect any year-end merit increases

Source University of California, Office of the President, and the California State University, Office of the Chancellor

ministrators are annualized for 1988-89, and include an estimated 6 0 percent salary increase that was provided on June 1, 1989 Campus administrative salary data, however, are annual averages that do not reflect the estimated 6 0 percent salary increase that was provided on June 1, 1989 State

University systemwide estimated annualized salaries effective July 1, 1989 are shown in Display 13 Like those of the University of California, these salaries are expected to increase further in January 1990 when additional salary adjustments are anticipated

**DISPLAY 13** *Estimated Annualized Salaries of Central-Office Administrators at the University of California and the California State University, effective July 1, 1989\**

Administrative Title and Number of Positions	University of California	Administrative Title and Number of Positions	The California State University
President (1)	\$ 214,500	Chancellor (1)	\$136,242
Senior Vice Presidents (2)	139,300	Executive Vice Chancellor (1)	118,972
Vice Presidents (3)	121,400 to 125,100	Vice Chancellors (4)	111,978 to 117,295
Associate Vice Presidents (4)	101,558** to 120,098**	Deputy Vice Chancellor (1)	93,937
Assistant Vice-Presidents (10)	84,666** to 109,386**	Assistant Vice Chancellors (10)	77,388 to 94,103
Director of State Govern- mental Relations (1)	97,541**	Director of Governmental Affairs (1)	100,145
University Auditor (1)	86,520**	University Auditor (1)	82,680
General Counsel (1)	142,900		
Treasurer (1)	164,300	General Counsel (1)	117,295
Associate Treasurer (1)	136,300		
Secretary to the Regents (1)	98,600	Associate General Counsel (1)	91,202

\* An additional salary increase for these positions of about 4 percent is anticipated for January 1, 1990

\*\* Effective January 1, 1989, a one-time addition to salary was made to replace a 3 percent tax-deferred annuity contribution

Source University of California, Office of the President, and the California State University, Office of the Chancellor



# 3

## *Medical School Faculty Salaries at the University of California*

DURING the 1978 Legislative Session, the Budget Conference Committee adopted the following Supplemental Language to the Budget Bill

The University of California shall report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission annually on (1) its full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (including a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution), and (2) the number of compensation plan exceptions in effect at each UC school

In 1979, the University selected eight comparison institutions -- Stanford, the State University of New York's Upstate Medical School, the University of Illinois (Chicago), Michigan (Ann Arbor), Texas (Houston), and Wisconsin (Madison), and Yale -- five of which were also on the comparison list for regular faculty -- and also explained the procedures used to compensate faculty physicians (Appendix B). Subsequently, due to data collection problems, SUNY's Upstate Medical School was replaced by that of the University of North Carolina's at Chapel Hill

In 1985, the Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology, which includes representatives from the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, the segments, and the Commission, agreed that while the medical faculty salary report was useful to complete the picture of faculty salaries generally, there was little need to provide it on an annual basis. This conclusion stemmed from the dual facts that University physicians are paid by the State on the same schedule as regular 11-month faculty on the general campuses, and that previous reports had not resulted in any changes in fiscal or programmatic policy at the medical schools. Accordingly, the advisory committee, and subsequently the Commission, agreed to biennial submissions of the salary data

Since the first report was published by the Commis-

sion in 1979, salary data have been included for general medicine, surgery, and pediatrics that, taken together, have been used to represent all medical disciplines. In addition, the University has provided an overview of the various clinical compensation plans employed by its comparison group, as well as its own procedures for compensating medical faculty

Displays 14, 15, and 16 on pages 22 and 23 show 1988-89 University of California and comparison institution data in the three specialties -- general medicine, surgery, and pediatrics. These data indicate that University medical faculty exceed the mean compensation at their comparison institutions by between 3.6 percent and 12.7 percent in five of the nine categories shown, and trail the average compensation of their comparison group by between 3.3 percent and 14.9 percent in the remaining four categories

The University's medical faculty ranks fourth, eighth, and fifth at the professor, associate professor and assistant professor ranks, respectively, in general medicine, third, seventh, and sixth in surgery, and third, second, and second in pediatrics. In recent years, there has been a slight decline overall in the University's relative position ranking when compared to its comparison group, due primarily to delayed annual cost-of-living increases. Full-professor medical faculty in all three specialties surveyed exceed the comparison institution mean salary, however, at the lower ranks of associate professor and assistant professor, University faculty trail their comparison institution counterparts in both general medicine and surgery. Only in pediatrics does the University exceed the comparison group's average salary at each ladder rank, although this specialty remains the lowest paying on the average of all medical specialties. The University's position for each rank and specialty in six of the past eight years is shown in Display 17 on page 23

**DISPLAY 14 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89  
(General Medicine)**

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
D	1	\$144,737	1	\$126,570	1	\$93,931
B	2	143,777	2	98,375	6	70,475
F	3	127,000	5	94,000	3	75,000
<b>University of California</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>126,625</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>90,107</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>72,166</b>
E	5	112,240	6	93,433	8	65,714
A	6	111,667	7	91,333	7	66,942
C	7	111,250	3	95,734	2	75,464
G	8	105,010	4	94,583	4	74,835
Comparison Institution Mean Salary <sup>1</sup>		\$122,240		\$99,147		\$74,623
Standard Deviation		\$14,313		\$11,050		\$8,174
Percentage by which UC exceeds or (lags) comparison institution mean salary		3.6%		(9.2%)		(3.3%)

<sup>1</sup> Equal weight to each comparison institution

Source: University of California, Office of the President

**DISPLAY 15 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89 (Surgery)**

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
D	1	\$249,373	2	\$176,935	2	\$133,100
C	2	218,500	1	233,000	1	168,750
<b>University of California</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>209,780</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>143,051</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>104,740</b>
F	4	202,000	4	172,000	3	132,000
A	5	201,250	3	175,500	4	125,001
B	6	177,077	6	147,666	5	109,000
G	7	175,551	8	114,102	8	95,648
E	8	167,425	5	157,856	7	95,899
Comparison Institution Mean Salary <sup>1</sup>		\$198,739		\$168,151		\$122,771
Standard Deviation		\$25,163		\$32,308		\$23,029
Percentage by which UC exceeds or (lags) comparison institution mean salary		5.6%		(-14.9%)		(-14.7%)

<sup>1</sup> Equal weight to each comparison institution

Source: University of California, Office of the President.

**DISPLAY 16 University of California Medical School Faculty Salary Survey, 1988-89 (Pediatrics)**

Institution Code	Rank	Professor	Rank	Associate Professor	Rank	Assistant Professor
B	1	\$127,000	1	\$98,600	5	\$68,111
F	2	121,000	4	86,000	1	76,000
<b>University of California</b>	3	<b>120,498</b>	2	<b>91,465</b>	2	<b>75,773</b>
D	4	112,552	3	88,118	3	72,287
E	5	109,468	7	82,318	7	61,620
A	6	103,300	6	82,636	4	70,000
C	7	96,889	5	83,800	6	63,222
G	8	91,977	8	68,888	8	59,435
Comparison Institution Mean Salary <sup>1</sup>		\$108,884		\$84,337		\$67,239
Standard Deviation		\$11,553		\$7,991		\$5,947
Percentage by which UC exceeds comparison institution mean salary		10.7%		8.5%		12.7%

<sup>1</sup> Equal weight to each comparison institution

Source: University of California, Office of the President

**DISPLAY 17 Ranking of University of California Medical Faculty Compensation in Relation to the Amounts Paid at its Comparison Institutions, Selected Years from 1980-81 to 1988-89**

Specialty and Academic Rank	Position in Relation to the Eight Comparison Institutions					
	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1984-85	1986-87	1988-89
<b>General Medicine</b>						
Professor	3	3	4	4	4	4
Associate Professor	4	4	6	4	2	8
Assistant Professor	2	4	4	3	2	5
<b>Surgery</b>						
Professor	3	2	4	3	3	3
Associate Professor	3	4	5	6	5	7
Assistant Professor	5	5	4	6	3	6
<b>Pediatrics</b>						
Professor	1	2	3	3	2	3
Associate Professor	2	2	4	3	2	2
Assistant Professor	4	3	6	5	1	2

Source: University of California, Office of the President.



# Appendix A

August 9, 1979

Gerald Hayward  
Director of Legislative and Public Affairs  
California Community Colleges  
1238 S Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Jerry:

As you know, the Legislature took several actions during the current session concerning the reporting of salary data. The first of these emanated from the Legislative Analyst's report and requires the Commission to include the Community Colleges in our annual reports on University of California and California State University and Colleges faculty salaries. The second action appropriated \$15,000 to the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of collecting salary data for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years. The latter action, however did not specify the type of information to be collected.

It is my understanding that you discussed this subject with Bill Storey and agreed that we should develop a detailed list of the information we will require for our report. After that, I presume you will contact us if there are any questions or ambiguities.

Our questions fall into three categories: (1) full-time faculty, (2) part-time faculty, and (3) administrators. For each of these, we will need the following:

## *Full-time faculty*

1. A listing of all salary classifications (e.g. BA + 30, MA, etc.) for each Community College District.
2. The actual salary at each step of each classification.
3. The number of faculty at each step of each classification.
4. The amounts of any bonuses that are granted to faculty, the number of faculty receiving them, the total salary of every faculty member receiving a bonus, and the reason for granting the bonus.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.
6. The total number of full-time faculty in each district.
7. The mean salary received by those full-time faculty.
8. The total dollar amount paid to full-time faculty as a group.

## *Part-time faculty*

1. The total number of part-time faculty employed by each district on both a headcount and full-time-equivalent (FTE) basis.
2. The mean salary paid to each headcount faculty member in each district.
3. The mean salary paid to each FTE faculty member in each district.

Gerald Hayward  
August 9, 1979  
Page 2

4. The total dollar amount paid to all part-time faculty in each district.
5. A summary of the compensation plan for part-time faculty members in each district.

*Administrators*

1. A list of all administrative positions (titles) in each district.
2. The salary schedule for each position
3. The number of headcount and FTE employees occupying each administrative position.
4. The actual salary paid to each employee in each administrative position.
5. The percentage increase in salary granted (i.e. the range adjustment) for the fiscal year covered by the report.

A few words of explanation may be in order. The data requested for full-time faculty are very similar to those that have been collected by the Chancellor's Office for a number of years but which were not collected for 1978-79 due to Proposition 13 reductions. The only major difference relates to the detail on bonuses that was not clearly presented in prior reports.

We are asking for data on part-time faculty because of objections raised by Community College representatives. At the time our preliminary report on Community College salaries was presented, many Community College representatives, including those from the Chancellor's Office, complained that the data were misleading because part-time faculty were not included. To avoid that difficulty in the future, it is imperative that data on these faculty be included in next year's report to the Legislature.

We are also asking for data on administrators because of the concerns expressed by both the Legislature (on the subject of academic administration generally) and various Community College faculty organizations. I am not sure we will publish any of the data on administrators but we do want to be able to respond to questions should they arise.

The final item concerns the dates for receipt of the data. As you know, we publish two salary reports each year. Since the University and the State University report to us each year by November 1, we think it would be appropriate to set November 1 as a reporting date (for the 1978-79 data) for the Chancellor's Office as well. For the 1979-80 data, we would like to have a report by March 1 so that we may include it in our final report to the Legislature. In future years, the March 1 date should become permanent.

If you have any questions concerning any of these matters, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Kenneth B. O'Brien, Jr.  
Associate Director

KBOB mc

# *Appendix B*

Office of the President  
March, 1979

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
REPORT ON MEDICAL SCHOOL CLINICAL COMPENSATION PLANS AND  
CLINICAL FACULTY SALARIES

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. CLINICAL COMPENSATION PLANS	
General . . . . .	1
University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan . . . . .	3
Comparison Data Survey . . . . .	4
Selection of Comparison Institutions . . . . .	5
II. COMPENSATION SURVEY . . . . .	6
Data Collection . . . . .	6
Selection of Departments and Disciplines . . . . .	7
The Method . . . . .	7
Results of the Clinical Salary Comparison and University of California Standing in Each Category . . . . .	8
III. EXCEPTIONS TO THE PLAN . . . . .	9
TABLES	
1. Comparison Institutions - Medical Schools . . . . .	10
2. Medical Practice Plan Typology (Chart) . . . . .	11
3. Medicine Department Average Salary . . . . .	12
4. Pediatrics Department Average Salary . . . . .	13
5. Surgery Department Average Salary . . . . .	14
APPENDICES	
A. Explanation of Medical School Faculty Salary Survey Conducted by the University of California With the Eight Participating Comparison Medical Schools . . . . .	16
B. Brief Descriptions of the Medical Compensation Plans at the Eight Comparison Medical Schools . . . . .	19





# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Report on Medical School Clinical Compensation Plans and Clinical Faculty Salaries

This report responds to Item 322 of the 1978 Conference Committee's Supplemental Report on the Budget Bill which recommends that:

UC shall report to CPEC annually on (1) its full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (including a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution) and (2) the number of compensation plan exceptions in effect at each UC school.

This report discusses the issues in the above supplemental language by providing:

1. a description of the type of compensation plans utilized by each UC school and each comparison institution (Section I);
2. a discussion of the University's full-time clinical faculty salaries and those of its comparison institutions (Section II); and
3. a report on compensation plan exceptions (Section III).

### I. Clinical Compensation Plans

#### General

Clinical compensation plans are compensation arrangements created by medical schools to provide competitive income for physicians and other faculty with direct patient-care responsibility as well as to further the academic goals of the medical schools. As stated by the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) in their December, 1977 report on An In-Depth Study of Seven Medical Practice Plans,

"The most commonly stated plan objective is the attraction and retention of quality faculty through the provision of acceptable compensation levels not achievable through other salary sources. An additional objec-

tive quite prevalent among the . . . plans is the use of plan revenue to help achieve departmental and schoolwide program enrichment with stable, flexible funds."

The AAMC reviewed the medical practice plans of the 112 M.D. degree-granting fully accredited medical schools in the U.S. and concluded that the plans could be characterized by the degree of central control exercised over the details of the plans' operations, along a "centralized/decentralized" axis. A summary of the three basic types of clinical compensation plans was developed by the AAMC as follows:

Type A - a highly centralized compensation approach, characterized by two basic and interrelated features. First, all patient-care fees are collected and deposited to central accounts, usually with few references to the origin of the bill beyond the requirements of accurate book-keeping and physician liability and accountability for services rendered. Second, physicians are placed on either individually set or departmentally fixed incomes based on a predetermined compensation schedule which recognizes such features as academic rank, previous or current clinical services, and additional merit or service features.

Type B - an intermediate arrangement in which some common policy framework exists for patient-care fee collection and disbursement. In this approach a general policy is set for all medical school faculty with patient-care responsibilities, requiring that they follow specified billing and collection procedures through a central office or departmental offices. Compensation is determined by a formula which recognizes the productivity of patient-care activities as well as academic factors such as rank and scholarship. Such compensation arrangements usually set broad ranges for total compensation, recognizing the aforementioned features, with set maxima either by department, school, or specialty.

Type C - the least disciplined arrangement, which allows wide variation by individual department or among specialties as to how patient-care fees are collected and subsequently distributed. The most extreme example permits the faculty member to bill and retain virtually all of the billable practice income with some requirement to reimburse the institution for overhead cost (office space, hospital fees, etc.).

Table 2 (p. 11), provides a further description of this medical practice plan typology, indicating by directional arrows the kind of movement that typically occurs in the organization of a practice plan--from no plan to decentralized, to intermediate, and to centralized.

University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan  
The University of California uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan, approved by The Regents in November, 1977 for implementation in 1978, falls within the Type B category. It provides a uniform framework for patient-care billing and sets uniform compensation maxima based on academic rank and step. The Plan provides sufficient flexibility so that specific parameters for the various medical specialties or disciplines within the same department may be established as long as the maximum compensation arrangements established by the Plan are not exceeded.

The key features of this Plan are:

1. The eleven-month regular faculty salary scale approved by The Regents for each faculty rank forms the base salary for all medical school ladder rank faculty. There is no differential in the base salary between medical school faculty and general campus faculty.
2. Arrangements for compensation in addition to the base salary are limited to three types.
  - a. Negotiated Income - This is an amount of additional compensation

determined by a department or school that a clinician can earn via contribution of income from patient-care (and certain other specified income sources) to a group or pooled income system. There is an absolute ceiling on this amount, as discussed below.

- b. Income Limitation Arrangements - These are arrangements whereby the faculty member may retain, subject to assessments, income directly from patient-care activities. Assessments are progressive and reach a nearly confiscatory level at approximately three times the faculty member's base salary.
  - c. Combination Plans - These are arrangements whereby faculty members share a predetermined portion of a pooled amount and are allowed to retain individual earnings beyond that amount up to a maximum ceiling.
3. Membership in this Plan is mandatory for all clinical faculty with patient-care responsibility who hold an appointment at 50% or more time, and all income from professional services performed by these faculty is subject to the terms of the Plan.
  4. Accounting standards and monitoring practices are specified in the guidelines for implementation of this Plan. Along with the Plan and guidelines, accounting procedures have been developed which are consistent with the Plan objectives.

#### Comparison Data Survey

One of the principal features of the uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan is a provision for periodic review of the established compensation maxima. In Section IV (Compensation), which sets forth the formulae for deriving maximum compensation, provision IV.3.6 states:

Compensation levels and assessment rates will be reviewed periodically by the Vice President--Academic and Staff Personnel Relations in light of comparison data from University of California Medical Schools as

well as from other comparison institutions. On the basis of the Vice President's report, the President, after consultation with the Academic Senate, may recommend adjustments in the compensation levels in this Plan to The Regents.

A set of comparison institutions was selected and a statistical method adopted that would yield the requisite data to satisfy this provision of the Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan as well as the requirement for an annual report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

#### Selection of Comparison Institutions

Eight institutions that represent comparable programs were selected from public and private sectors. Five of the institutions are public in character and three are private. The institutions selected represent a diverse spectrum and sufficient variation of settings and practice plan arrangements to provide valid comparisons. Appendix B (see pp. 19-20) provides a brief description of the various compensation plans used by the comparison institutions.

#### Comparison Institutions

<u>Name</u>	Public or Private	Compensation Plan
*Stanford	Private	yes
State Univ. of New York- Upstate Medical School	Public	yes
Univ. of Chicago	Private	yes
*Univ. of Illinois	Public	no
*Univ. of Michigan	Public	yes
Univ. of Texas, Houston	Public	yes
*Univ. of Wisconsin	Public	yes
*Yale University	Private	yes

The comparison institutions included five that are also in the general campus survey (noted by asterisks). In addition, the University of Texas, Houston, and the State University of New York-Upstate Medical School were selected because they are part of larger multicampus systems with more than one medical school.

## II. Compensation Survey

### A. Data Collection

Compensation plan information was obtained from the eight comparison medical schools by means of a questionnaire (see Appendix A, pp. 16-18). The questionnaire was followed by phone calls, and a special meeting which took place during the October, 1978 meeting of the AAMC in New Orleans. At that special meeting of the comparison schools, there was an extended discussion of the practical aspects of medical salary and practice plan management, and arrangements were made to meet and/or consult each year and to regularly exchange data. Further, Mr. William L. Storey, Higher Education specialist with the California Postsecondary Education Commission, was consulted about this comparison study, and has agreed to meet to discuss in detail the methodology and conclusions.

### B. Selection of Departments and Disciplines

Comparison of medical schools' salaries raises problems which do not occur in comparing salaries of general campuses. On general university campuses, overall salary averages for a given professorial rank are a good reflection of what the individual faculty member is actually paid at that rank. In medical schools, however, there is great variation in individual salaries, and an overall salary average for a given medical school is statistically unreliable. For that reason, it was not possible to use overall salary averages from the comparison medical schools in

this study. Statistics from the annual AAMC report of clinical salaries were similarly of little utility since they tend to aggregate salaries from a variety of clinicians, both full and part-time, without sufficient disaggregation in the sample to make the data useful for this survey. The method that was devised to avoid the above problems was to select a stratified sample of three clinical specialties which are commonly found in schools of medicine and which typically represent a range of compensation within medical schools. The three clinical specialties selected are (a) Pediatrics, typically at a lower level of compensation; (b) Medicine, typically at a mid-level compensation; and (c) Surgery, typically at a higher compensation. These three clinical specialties are taken as representative of the medical schools at large and are used as the base for developing the data for this study. The salary data received from the thirteen medical schools (five from UC and eight from comparison institutions) are treated as follows: a single weighted-average compensation is constructed from the five UC medical school responses for each of the three specialties. That weighted average is displayed in a ranked table (ranked by professorial compensation) together with the responses from the eight comparison medical schools (see Tables 3, 4, and 5, pp. 12, 13, and 14).

### C. The Method

For each of the specialties a simple average of the resulting table of nine weighted averages is then calculated, as well as the standard deviation, and entered at the bottom of each of Table 3, 4 and 5. The single average for the five medical schools is examined in each of the three ranked tables to determine where that average falls within the sample of nine weighted averages; i.e., whether or not that particular average deviates significantly from the general average. The



tables reflect the following:

- a. where the UC average falls within one standard deviation;
- b. where the UC average is with respect to the average for the group as a whole; and
- c. whether the UC average is within one standard deviation of the group average.

If the UC average is, in fact, within one standard deviation from the group average, then the UC average can be considered to be not statistically different from that of the group as a whole.

#### D. Results of the Clinical Salary Comparison and University of California Standing in Each Category

Tables 3, 4, and 5 (see pp. 12, 13, and 14) indicate that the University's average compensation is consistent with the overall average for each specialty, as displayed below:

#### AVERAGE FULL PROFESSOR COMPENSATION - ABSTRACTED FROM TABLES 3, 4, 5.

Medicine		Pediatrics		Surgery	
High	67,000	High	67,000	High	88,000
Average	60,440	UC	59,000	Average	79,440
UC	59,000	Average	57,560	UC	75,000
Low	54,000	Low	51,000	Low	67,000

From the table above, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. In Medicine (Table 3, p.12), average professorial compensation ranges from a high of \$67,000 per year to a low of \$54,000, with an average of \$60,440. The UC average for Medicine is \$59,000, slightly below the group average.
2. In Pediatrics (Table 4, p.13), average professorial compensation ranges

from a high of \$67,000 per year to a low of \$51,000, with an average of \$57,560. The UC average for Pediatrics is \$59,000, slightly (but not significantly) higher than the group average (within one standard deviation from the average).

3. In Surgery (Table 5, p. 15), average professorial compensation ranges from a high of \$88,000 per year to a low of \$67,000, with an average of \$79,440. The UC average for Surgery is \$75,000, somewhat (but not significantly) below the group average.

Within each of the three specialties, the spread of salaries is not great, supporting the assumption that the selected medical schools are comparable. In each of the tables for the three specialties, the University's average compensation is close to the overall average, as is displayed in the table above. For these reasons, the compensation being paid in University of California medical schools can be considered to be representative, competitive and appropriate. Therefore, there appears to be no need at this time to alter the current compensation formulas.

### III. Exceptions to the Plan

Requests for exceptions, including individual exceptions, to the Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan may originate with the individual department, and, subject to approval by the Dean, are then forwarded to the campus Chancellor for the next approval step. The Chancellor then consults with the campus Academic Senate. If the Chancellor approves the exception, the request is recommended to the President for final approval. All approved exceptions to compensation limits must be reported to the Board of Regents.

As part of the implementation of the Plan it was agreed that certain limited existing arrangements would be permitted to continue. Other than these exceptions, no individual exceptions have been made. Irvine has been permitted to delay implementation of the Plan until January, 1980 in order to accommodate the campus conversion from a gross to a net clinical fee compensation plan.



TABLE 1

## COMPARISON INSTITUTIONS - MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Stanford University

State University of New York -  
Upstate Medical School

University of Chicago

University of Illinois

University of Michigan

University of Texas, Houston

University of Wisconsin

Yale University

TABLE 2

## MEDICAL PRACTICE PLAN TYPOLOGY

PLAN FEATURES	TYPE A Centralized ←		TYPE B Intermediate ←		TYPE C Decentralized	
Organization & Participation						
• Structure	A discretely recognized entity, either within or external to the medical school, having its own personnel, budget and procedural guidelines.		A common framework for clinical practice activity exists within which departmental or specialty groups function.		A variety of clinical practice arrangements for academic departments or medical specialties are permitted.	
• Policy Determination	All practicing clinicians are included and directly and/or indirectly through their representatives meet with institutional officials to focus only on clinical practice - related issues.		Most clinical disciplines are participants in deliberations about clinical practice - related issues identified by institutional officials.		Executive faculty and the dean consult as necessary during the routine conduct of general meetings.	
Operations						
• Administration	A full-time manager supervises the day-to-day plan operation with responsibility for all administrative services supporting the practice of medicine		A member of the dean's regular administrative staff is the focus for coordination of many plan support services		Either the department head or his designate directs administrative support services.	
• Fee Handling	All clinical practice related revenue flows through the Plan Office which condenses bills, collects fees and disburses income.		Uniform procedures for billing, collection and disbursement of fees are implemented.		Options for billing, collection or disbursement of fees are available to academic departments or medical specialties	
Private Medical Schools	12		10		3	
Public Medical Schools	21		16		5	

The above table is taken from An In-Depth Study of Seven Medical Practice Plans--Association of American Medical Colleges, December, 1977, p. 14.

The arrows show the kind of movement that typically occurs in the organization of a practice plan, from no plan, to decentralized, to intermediate, and to centralized.

## APPENDIX A

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Annual Medical School Faculty Salary Survey

## Instructions

The form will be provided for three departments only, General Medicine, Pediatrics, and Surgery. Three categories of compensation are identified with definitions. These are:

1. Base or Guaranteed Component - the base salary derived from University of California salary scales for that rank and guaranteed by the University exclusive of fringe benefits;
2. University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation, or expected compensation, not including the base salary described in 1, above, which is received through or as a result of the operation of, and the individual faculty member's participation in, the University of California Uniform Medical School Clinical Compensation Plan, and
3. Grand Total Compensation - the sum of the monies associated with items 1 and 2 above, divided by the head count for that line of the questionnaire.

In each case, one calculates the average for each box in the questionnaire by totalling all the monies involved in that category and then by dividing by the head count for that line of the questionnaire. Reasonable estimates of the year's earnings should be reported

or last year's actual earnings with any estimated increment. Please specify the method used in the "comments" section at the bottom of each questionnaire.

For the departments specified above, include only 12 month salaries for full-time paid faculty utilizing September 1 budget figures whenever possible. Include the full salary of faculty on sabbatical leave. Exclude those faculty at affiliated institutions, full salary for vacant positions, house staff and fellows in all ranks and part-time and volunteer faculty.

Attached is a list of the subspecialties to be included within three departments (General Medicine, Pediatrics and Surgery). If you have any questions, please phone R.D. Menhennett at (415):642-1454.

SURGERY

GENERAL SURGERY  
THORACIC  
CARDIO-VASCULAR  
E.N.T.  
UROLOGY  
NEUROSURGERY  
ORTEOPEDICS  
PLASTIC

MEDICINE

GENERAL  
CARDIOLOGY  
ENDOCRINOLOGY  
GASTROENTEROLOGY  
HEMATOLOGY  
HEPATOLOGY  
INFECTIOUS DISEASE  
NEPHROLOGY  
RHEUMATOLOGY  
PULMONARY

PEDIATRICS

ALL, INCLUDING  
PEDIATRIC  
CARDIOLOGY



CAMPUS \_\_\_\_\_ DATE THE REPORT WAS PREPARED \_\_\_\_\_

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MEDICAL SCHOOL FACULTY SALARY SURVEY

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_ EFFECTIVE DATE \_\_\_\_\_

RANK

COMPENSATION

Grand Total  
Compensation  
(Average)\*

Uniform Compensation  
Plan Component  
(Average)\*

Base Salary or  
Guaranteed  
Component (Average)\*

Rank Headcount

Professor

Associate  
Professor

Assistant  
Professor

Instructor

\*Average salary for each of the three compensation columns should be computed by dividing the total dollars by the headcount for each rank.

Comments on qualifications: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

### Brief Descriptions of the Medical Compensation Plans at the Eight Comparison Medical Schools

#### 1) Stanford University

Stanford has a new practice plan that is currently being written and is not yet available.

#### 2) State University of New York - Upstate Medical School

Overall management of the practice plan is vested in a governing board consisting essentially of the President, the Dean of the Medical School and the medical school department chairmen. The departments have considerable autonomy, and keep the accounts and do the billing. The State is paid for overhead costs, and the Medical School levies a surcharge on gross practice plan income for its own use. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

#### 3) University of Chicago

General guidelines are issued to the departments by the Dean's office. Within those guidelines, individual practice plans are negotiated on a departmental basis. The medical school is experimenting with a surcharge, and with various kinds of non-salary incentives. Currently, however, the individual departments have a good deal of autonomy. (A Type "C" Plan)

#### 4. University of Illinois

No formal practice plan exists. The medical school provides centralized billing facilities. Beyond that, what happens is the result of individual negotiation between the individual faculty member, his department and the Dean's office.

#### 5. University of Michigan

The plan is centralized, with a formal central business office run by a full-time Director who reports directly to the Dean of the Medical School. The central business office establishes policy, does billing and handles

disbursements. The individual departments have comparatively little autonomy. The plan was phased in gradually over the five-year period from 1973 to 1978. (A Type "A" Plan)

6) University of Texas at Houston

The plan is controlled by a Board of Directors consisting of the President, V.P. for Business Affairs and the department chairmen. The plan provides for central billing and disbursement of funds; however, individual faculty salaries are set through individual negotiation between a faculty member and his department chairman. The departments have considerable autonomy. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

7) University of Wisconsin

Although a written plan exists, its net effect is to vest authority in the individual departments. Each department creates in effect its own individual practice plan and does pretty much as it pleases, subject to certain maximum salary constraints written into the central plan. (A Type "B" or Type "C" Plan)

8) Yale University

The practice plan consists of a series of brief salary guidelines published by the Dean which set up a framework for salary payment and establish the permissible salary ranges within which an individual faculty member may be paid. Each department develops its own practice plan, in negotiation with the Dean's office. Individual salaries are recommended by the department chairman and approved by the Dean. (A Type "C" Plan)

# References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Faculty Salaries in California Public Higher Education, 1979-80* Commission Report 79-6 Sacramento: The Commission, April 1979

-- *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95 A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs* Commission Report 85-11 Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985

-- *Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87 A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation* Commission Report 87-36 Sacramento: The

Commission, September 1987

-- *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89 The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No 51* Commission Report 88-9 Sacramento: The Commission, March 1988

-- *Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90 The Commission's 1988 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No 51* Commission Report 89-11 Sacramento: The Commission, March 1989

Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges *Study of Part-Time Instruction*. Sacramento: Research Analysis Unit, Chancellor's Office, January 1987

# CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature

## Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of February 1990, the Commissioners representing the general public are

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;  
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach,  
Henry Der, San Francisco,  
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco,  
Rosalind K. Goddard, Los Angeles,  
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach,  
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero, *Vice Chair*,  
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Chair*, and  
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are

Meredith J. Khachigian, San Clemente, appointed by the Regents of the University of California,

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco, appointed by the Trustees of the California State University,

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom, appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges,

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks, appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions,

Joseph D. Carrabino, Orange, appointed by the California State Board of Education, and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo, appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities

## Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

## Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, its meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request before the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 30 to 40 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985, telephone (916) 445-7933.

# SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC SALARIES, 1988-89

## California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 89-26

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include

**89-10** Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity: A Needs Assessment of Educational Services for Eligible Legalized Aliens in California Under the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant Program of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 23, 1989, by California Tomorrow (March 1989)

**89-11** Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1989)

**89-12** Teacher Preparation Programs Offered by California's Public Universities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 State Budget Act (March 1989)

**89-13** The State's Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 78 (Resolution Chapter 22, 1988) (March 1989)

**89-14** Analysis of the Governor's Proposed 1989-90 Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

**89-15** Planning Our Future: A Staff Background Paper on Long-Range Enrollment and Facilities Planning in California Public Higher Education (April 1989)

**89-16** Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1988: The Fourth in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (April 1989)

**89-17** Protecting the Integrity of California Degrees: The Role of California's Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977 in Educational Quality Control (April 1989)

**89-18** Recommendations for Revising the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977: A Report to

the Legislature and Governor on Needed Improvements in State Oversight of Privately Supported Postsecondary Education (April 1989)

**89-19** Mandatory Statewide Student Fees in California's Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities: Report of the Sunset Review Committee on Statewide Student Fee Policy Under Senate Bill 195 (1985), published for the Committee by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (April 1989)

**89-20** State Policy Guidelines for Adjusting Nonresident Tuition at California's Public Colleges and Universities: Report of the Advisory Committee on Nonresident Tuition Policies Under Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, published for the Committee by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (June 1989)

**89-21** State Oversight of Postsecondary Education: Three Reports on California's Licensure of Private Institutions and Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation [A reprint of Reports 89-13, 89-17, and 89-18] (June 1989)

**89-22** Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University (June 1989)

**89-23** Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, 1988-89: The University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (August 1989)

**89-24** California College-Going Rates, Fall 1988 Update: The Twelfth in a Series of Reports on New Freshman Enrollments at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (September 1989)

**89-25** Overseeing the Heart of the Enterprise: The Commission's Thirteenth Annual Report on Program Projection, Approval, and Review Activities, 1987-88 (September 1989)

**89-26** Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1988-89: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1989)

**89-27** Technology and the Future of Education: Directions for Progress: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission's Policy Task Force on Educational Technology (September 1989)